

Rural Municipality of Eastern Kings

COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES Tuesday, June 25, 2019 at 6:15 PM

In attendance: Mayor Grace Cameron, Deputy Mayor Danelle Elliott Councillors Bernadette McInnis, David Stewart, Anne McPhee, Arthur Baker, Chief Administrative Officer Ron Coffin

Regrets: Councillor Bradley MacDonald

1. Call to Order – At 6:15 Mayor Grace Cameron called meeting to order, there was a quorum so the meeting proceeded.
2. Conflict of Interest Declaration – Individual Councillors, Mayor Grace Cameron and Councillor Bernadette McInnis declared a conflict regarding item 5 on the agenda.
3. Agenda Approval – It was moved by Anne McPhee and seconded by Danelle Elliott that the agenda be approved as presented. All in favour and the motion was carried.
4. Minutes Approval – April 9, 2019 It was moved by Danelle Elliott and seconded by David Stewart that the minutes be approved as amended. All in favour and the motion was carried.

Minutes Approval – May 14 , 2019 It was moved by Bernadette McInnis and seconded by Anne McPhee that the minutes be approved as amended. All in favour and the motion was carried.

Minutes Approval – May 20, 2019 It was moved by David Stewart and seconded by Arthur Baker that the minutes be approved as amended. All in favour and the motion was carried.

Minutes Approval – May 21, 2019 It was moved by Arthur Baker and seconded by Danelle Elliott that the minutes be approved as amended. All in favour and the motion was carried.

Minutes Approval – June 11, 2019 It was moved by Bernadette McInnis and seconded by Anne McPhee that the minutes be approved as amended. All in favour and the motion was carried.

At 6:49 pm Mayor Grace Cameron and Councillor Bernadette McInnis recused themselves from the meeting and they left the proceedings. From this point the meeting was chaired by Deputy Mayor Danelle Elliott.

5. Old Business – Resolution to engage legal advice regarding Bylaw process for Special Permits and the preliminary Application from PEI Energy Corporation. The resolution was moved by Anne McPhee and seconded by Arthur Baker; all were in favour and the resolution was passed.

At this point in the meeting (given that there were 4 members of the public present) the meeting was briefly opened for comments, Pamela Kline commented on Wind Turbines in New York. She expressed her personal concern for the rural landscape in Eastern Kings. See appendix 'A' below for Pamela Kline full comments.

Rural Municipality of Eastern Kings

6. New Business

Under Part 5 section 119 (e) of the MGA , council moves to have a closed meeting,

119. Closed meetings

(1) Despite subsection 118(1), a council or council committee may, by resolution, close all or part of a meeting to the public, either in advance or at the meeting, where the matter to be discussed is, in relation to any of the following, confidential:

(e) a matter still under consideration, on which the council has not yet publicly announced a decision, and about which discussion in public would likely prejudice a municipality's ability to carry out its negotiations;

At 7:01 the motion was moved by Arthur Baker and seconded by Anne McPhee, the motion was carried and the meeting moved *in camera*. Council retired to the Municipal Office for the remainder of the meeting.

7. At 7:55 PM, council moved for adjournment, motion was made by Arthur Baker and seconded by David Stewart: all were in favour. The meeting was adjourned.

Signed in accordance *Municipal Government Act* S.116(4)

Grace Cameron – Mayor
Danelle Elliott – Deputy Mayor

Date

Ron Coffin – Chief Administrative Officer

Date

APPENDIX 'A'

June 28, 2019

Dear Eastern Kings Council,

I have a home on South Lake. I have been here for 20 years. Like many Americans, I came to PEI for the beauty it possesses in its land and sea. I am grateful for a community that respects and cares for its natural resources and for members of the community such as you who give their time and energy to govern for the benefit of all. I came, also, to escape the pipelines, the fracking, the bomb tucks, the power plants the invasive transmission lines and even the wind turbines. For the small rural community I come from in upstate New York has seen its magnificent Hudson River polluted, its mountain vistas marred, its farm lands traversed with monster power lines, its wetlands threatened and animal habitats destroyed.

And so I ask you: is this wind turbine expansion really in the best interest of our community? Who is actually benefiting? The energy produced goes into the grid as a credit. The prices are controlled by Maritime Electric. How do we benefit financially? This rural area like my American rural area is being asked to bear the impacts and the costs for URBAN needs. A dozen wind farms now operating in upstate New York have driven up the cost of electricity and have yet to produce even 1% of the state's electricity demand.

Rural Municipality of Eastern Kings

What we DO have is an industrial wasteland. The development of wind turbines can change drainage patterns and diminish water quality by silting up creeks, ponds and wetlands. Crisscrossing the countryside with access roads and transmission lines can fragment habitat and divert wildlife populations. It is well known wind turbines kill birds and bats. The visual and noise impacts diminish property values, offsetting gains to the host town by decreasing its property tax base. The character of the town changes.

The existing wind turbines are 125 meters tall. Hermanville's structures are 150 Meters tall. The new proposed turbines are 175 meters tall. Proponents of these turbines will tell you the negative noise impacts from them are safe, yet the World Health Organization recognizes sleep disturbance as a serious health problem. The W.H.O. recommends nighttime limits for noise be no greater than 30dB (A). Ontario has imposed a limit of 40dB (A) at residential property lines on noise from turbines, but that has not been sufficient to stop complaints. By comparison, rural nighttime sounds average 25dB (A) . Wind farms can average over 70 dB (A) well over 340 meters away.

You as our Council are being asked to grant the developer a preliminary application, one in which all impacts, all construction data have not been agreed upon or addressed. You will lose your ability to negotiate, to address impacts, and have your questions answered until it is too late and construction is underway. The By Laws clearly state that a full site plan showing all structures, roads, boundaries, natural features and alterations of sites be submitted. The By Laws also require all structural dimensions be clearly stated. The request for confidentiality is a blatant attempt to keep the public uninformed and disengaged.

The proponents are asking you for a variance. The By Laws were put into place by hardworking, dedicated members of our community like you who had a vision and the insight to protect our community. To grant a variance to allow the construction of the turbines to be built closer to our shore and to our neighbors would be irresponsible. According to the World Health Organization, 2000 meters is a safe distance from wind turbines. Our By Laws require only 1000 meters. The proponents are asking for 900 meters. The distance required from East Point Creek is only 60 meters!

In upstate New York, people were asked by wind developers to sign easement agreements that precluded any complaint by the land owner about noise, loss of hunting resources, intrusive "shadow flickers" caused when the blades catch the sun and damages from wind turbines leaking oil or throwing ice hundreds of feet at high velocity. At the same time, these companies tell us the turbines are safe and quiet. Neighboring land owners who don't sign can sue and are suing the company and the local town board (council) for allowing a nuisance. Local laws not establishing setbacks or granting variances not protective of their community are setting their communities up for divisive litigation.

I understand you require a 10% buffer. If the energy company builds within that buffer they will only pay 0.9%. However, if you give them a variance, they will pay 1.2%. If that is true then that monetary persuasion amounts to bribery.

Finally, are the present transmission lines adequate to carry the newly generated electricity? Will larger monster power lines be needed to traverse the farm land? This is happening in my rural community in New York where farm land, including my own, is being taken by eminent domain to build more transmission lines to transport wind generated electricity. I have mentioned all these comparisons with New York State because I hope you can benefit by our mistakes.

I sincerely hope you will require a full environmental impact study (EIS), a completed application (not partial or provisional) with all permits and studies in place and uphold the community By Laws. But most of all, I urge you to decide against the East Point Project. The wind class on PEI is a class 2, the most common wind class for turbines. In other words the entire project could be better located in a less impactful, less populated area. We are not the only or best site.

Very Sincerely Yours,
Pam Kline

Rural Municipality of Eastern Kings